

At the outset, it is noted that each of the independent claims of this application recite the feature that a first identification information which is previously stored in a display unit and a second identification information which is previously stored in an externally connected computer and sent from the computer are compared in the display unit. In accordance with the present invention as recited in the claims, communication between the externally connected computer and the display unit is permitted or prohibited as a result of the comparison of the first and second identification information and enables or disables display control, etc., memory control, etc., and the like, by the externally connected computer.

Applicants note that the aforementioned features enable a display system wherein, for example, a display unit which is connected to a network is controlled by any computer, including a personal computer, etc., connected to the network so as to allow only those computers which are authenticated to each other by the identification information to effect such control. In such an application system, products of any makers or products having different specifications from one another may be applied as the display unit and/or the computer (including a personal computer) only by providing the necessary software functions. Thus, confidentiality among users, protection from improper control or from rewriting of

memories with improper information so as to maintain full consistencies in utilizing the system may be maintained. Applicants submit that the aforementioned features are set forth in the previously submitted claims and the newly submitted claims herewith, and such features are not disclosed or taught in the cited art, as will become clear from the following discussion.

The rejection of claims 1-8 and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al (US No. 5,457,473) in view of Hibino et al (US No. 5,599,231) is traversed insofar as it is applicable to the present claims, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Turning first to Arai et al, the Examiner recognizes that while Arai et al disclose an image display apparatus having communication control circuit 18 for communicating with an external connected computer, "Arai et al do not disclose the communication control circuit comprising a comparing means for comparing a first identification information which is previously stored in the display unit and the second identification information which is previously stored in the computer and is sent from the computer; and a communication permission means for permitting communication between the computer with respect to the display control of the display unit, when the first and second identification information

match as a result of the comparison by the comparing means".  
(emphasis added) Thus, Arai et al merely discloses an image display apparatus which is capable of adjusting a display picture by an input unit through a computer body. It is readily apparent that nothing is disclosed or taught in Arai et al concerning the features recognized by the Examiner to be absent in Arai et al, in relation to control of a display unit, only based upon matching of identification information stored in the display unit in relation to information stored in the computer and sent to the display unit for comparison by a comparator of the display unit. As such, applicants submit that all of the claims of this application patentably distinguish over Arai et al with respect to the features recognized by the Examiner as being absent in Arai et al.

The Examiner cites Hibino et al in an attempt to overcome the recognized deficiencies of Arai et al, contending that Hibino et al disclose "the security systems and methods for a video graphics computer system and authentication game/program fabricating device comprising: a comparing means for a first identification information which is previously stored in the identification device and the second identification information which is previously stored in the computer and is sent from the computer; and a communication permission means for permitting communication between the computer with respect to the control (i.e. copy, edit) of the system when the first

and second identification information match as a result of the comparison by the comparing means..." (emphasis added).

Therefore, the Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combine the teachings of Hibino et al into the teachings of Arai et al because it would prevent the unauthorized use of the video graphics computer system.

Irrespective of the Examiner's contentions concerning Hibino et al, this patent discloses a video graphics/video game fabricating system including a main CPU which controls editing operations and operating system task execution and a game CPU, enabling users to create an original video game. The system includes security features to prevent unauthorized use and copying of proprietary data which are obtained by a unique IC card for insertion. Accordingly, the unique IC card which is inserted in the system console of the main CPU has stored ID data corresponding to matching ID data associated with the game CPU for enable execution of the video game which is loaded into a pluggable RAM cartridge. Further, such is utilized for preventing unauthorized copying and editing of the game cartridge. Irrespective of the Examiner's contentions, there is no disclosure or teaching in Hibino et al concerning the display unit having identification information stored therein and the external computer having

other identification information stored therein, with a comparing means and/or memory means being provided in the display unit for enabling communication of the computer and the display unit in the manner disclosed and claimed herein.

Applicants submit that the proposed combination represents a hindsight reconstruction attempt of the present invention utilizing the principle of "obvious to try" which is not the standard of 35 U.S.C. §103.

Reference is made to the decision of In re Fine, 5 USPQ 2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988), wherein the court pointed out that the PTO has the burden under §103 to establish a prima facie case of obviousness and can satisfy this burden only by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references. As noted by the court, whether a particular combination might be "obvious to try" is not a legitimate test of patentability and obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination. As further noted by the court, one cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention.

More particularly, referring to the amended claims

presented herein, it is noted that the claims have been amended to more clearly set forth the relationship between the computer and the display unit and such features are not disclosed or taught by Arai et al, as recognized by the Examiner, nor the combination of Arai et al and Hibino et al as suggested by the Examiner. Referring to claim 1, for example, this claim recites the feature that the first identification information and the second identification information are compared in the display unit and that communication between the externally connected computer and the display unit is permitted as a result of the comparison with display control being enabled by the externally connected computer, which features are not disclosed or taught in the cited art. Claim 3 has been amended to also recite the feature that the first identification information and the second identification information are compared in the display unit and that communication between the externally connected computer and the display unit is prohibited as a result of the comparison (failure to match), and the display control is disabled by the externally connected computer. Hereagain, such features are not disclosed in the cited art. Claim 4 also recites the feature that the first identification information and the second identification information are compared in the display unit and that communication between the externally connected computer and the display unit is

permitted as a result of the comparison and control of a display size/position of the display unit is enabled by the externally connected computer through a command. Such features are not disclosed in the cited art. Claim 10 recites the feature that the first identification information and the second identification information are compared in the display unit and that communication between the computer and the display unit is permitted as a result of the comparison with control of the memory means in the display unit being enabled by the externally connected computer. Hereagain, such features are not disclosed in the cited art. Claim 12 has been amended to recite the feature that the first identification information and the second identification information are compared in the display unit and communication between the externally connected computer and the display unit is prohibited as a result of the comparison (failure to match) and control of the memory means in the display unit is disabled by the externally connected computer. Such features are not disclosed or taught in the cited art. Thus, applicants submit that the aforementioned independent claims and the dependent claims patentably distinguish over the cited art in the sense of 35 U.S.C. §103, and should be considered allowable thereover.

With respect to the newly presented claims, it is noted that claims 15 and 16 depend from claims 10 and 12,

respectively, and recite further features. Claims 17 and 19 are independent claims reciting a display unit for displaying an image based upon a digital image information signal which digital image information signal is inputted from an externally connected computer and generally correspond to the features previously set forth in claims 1 and 3. As pointed out above, such features are not disclosed in the cited art. Claims 21-26 are also directed to a display unit, wherein the memory means of the display unit stores an identification number for making the externally connected computer recognizable that the display unit is communicatable with the computer and a communication controller for sending the identification number stored in the memory means to the computer, which features are described at page 13, lines 9-20 of the specification of this application. Applicants note that the cited art also does not disclose or teach such features and the newly presented claims should also be considered allowable at this time.

Applicants further note that an Information Disclosure Statement is submitted herewith together with the Information Disclosure Statement fee and consideration of such document is respectfully requested. More particularly, although EP 0 456 923 A1 may be considered applicable to the newly presented claims 21-26, in that such document discloses at col. 3, line 50 to col. 4, line 1, "identification codes" which includes

coded timing parameters for enabling a display adapter to generate appropriate video and sync signals, namely sync pulse widths, active video periods and blanking intervals, applicants note that such "identification codes" do not relate to an identification number (e.g., a product model number of the display unit) for making the externally connected computer recognizable that the display unit is communicatable with the computer and for sending the identification number to the externally connected computer, as recited in claims 21-26.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicants submit that in addition to allowed claim 9, claims 1-8 and 10-26, as presented herein, should now be in condition for allowance and issuance of an action of a favorable nature is courteously solicited.

To the extent necessary, applicant's petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in the fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (503.32696CX3) and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,



Melvin Kraus  
Registration No. 22,466  
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP

MK/cee  
(703) 312-6600